10¢

February 1961
Vol. 4, No. 2

SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST®

A FAIR SHARE FOR EVERY CHILD!

- **Should parents be penalized for a "FREE" choice of schools?**
- **Is a state monopoly BAD for business, but GOOD for education?**
- **Are our children SECOND-CLASS citizens?**

Condensed from a statement by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman at a meeting of the Cardinal's Education Fund in New York on January 17, 1961.

In the lead editorial in the Chicago Catholic "New World" of January 14, it is stated: "One of President-elect Kennedy's 'task forces,' pointedly described by some as a 'tax force,' has proposed a 9.3-billion-dollar program of federal aid to education. Of the total amount, 5.8 billion dollars would be allotted to public elementary and high schools."

No Catholic schools, or schools of other religious denominations, are included in the task-force proposal. For many millions of American parents, this means that they will be taxed more than ever before for the education of their children, but that they cannot expect any return from their taxes unless they are willing to transfer their children to a public grade or high school.

Unfair To Parents

I believe, and I state, that these recommendations are unfair to most parents of the nation's 6.8 million parochial and private-school children. Such legislation would discriminate against a multitude of America's children because their parents choose to exercise their constitutional right to educate them in accordance with their religious beliefs.

Under these proposals, parents would be compelled to surender both freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the education of their children as a condition for sharing in federal education funds in direct violation of the

(Continued on P. 3)

IN THIS ISSUE

		Page
A Fair Share For Every Child	*Francis Cardinal Spellman*	1
A Few Words From Your Editor	*Hubert F. Schiffer, S.J.*	2
Morals And Psychology	*John Marshall*	3
Neighbors And Social Status	*Commission on Race & Housing*	6
A Catholic Negro Girl At Georgia U.	*NCWC News Service*	6
Lift Up Your Eyes And See	*Christopher Notes*	7
U. S. Agrarian Reforms	*Msgr. George G. Higgins*	7
Safe Driving Is A Moral Duty	*Richard Cardinal Cushing*	8

A FEW WORDS FROM YOUR EDITOR . . .

Like all three-year-olds, the DIGEST is beginning to develop its own distinctive personality. You will find its new, linotype-printed editions easier to read. If subscriptions continue to increase in 1961, you can look forward to further improvements in appearance and contents — at the good old price of only $1.00 a year. You may be interested to know that 1,485 new readers joined the DIGEST's loyal friends and founders during the past year. Some of them dropped out in January, but 70% of our readers renewed their subscriptions, for an average of 1½ years.

You have come to expect challenging and thought-provoking articles in SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST. Well, the February issue offers you a variety of timely topics. There is, first, the statement by His Eminence Cardinal Spellman on the fair treatment of children in all accredited schools when it comes to distributing tax dollars collected from all citizens. Why should only a certain percentage of the nation's children be singled out for educational benefits? If it is in the national interest that their potential be fully developed, is it against the national interest to develop the potential of all children? Are we promoting a state monopoly on education which says, in effect, only state schools are the "right kind" of schools? Doesn't this mean that a religious orientation of education is "not right?" In other words, we find that the sincere efforts of religious men who wrote a Constitution to prevent the state from promoting any particular denomination are now resulting in the state discriminating against all religion and thus giving preference to a non-religious attitude. Strange, isn't it?

Many S. A. DIGEST readers are familiar with CITIZENS FOR EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM (3109 S. Grand Blvd.—Room 25, St. Louis 18, Mo.), a non-denominational group of people working to protect the freedom of parents against the growing state monopoly in education. We urge all our readers to join C.E.F. Membership fees are $2.00 a year per family.

The racial disturbances in New Orleans have opened the eyes of many Southerners who had lulled themselves to sleep in the belief that "it can't happen here." Unfortunately, it did happen. One of the effects of the continuing campaign of hatred, threats and midnight phone calls was the publication of an "appeal . . . for special prayers and sincere efforts to promote brotherly understanding," signed by 122 Catholic, Protestant and Jewish clergymen of New Orleans. Over 50,000 copies of the appeal were distributed at downtown churches on Christmas day.

The human side of racial problems is illustrated in the two articles "Neighbors and Social Status" and "A Catholic Negro Girl at Georgia U." Strangely enough, despite the racial troubles all around us, most Catholic pulpits remain silent. Isn't our silence giving comfort to the guilty? Are we really the descendants of the heroes who proclaimed their faith to the world and made people exclaim "Look how they love one another"?

HUBERT F. SCHIFFER, S.J.

EDITOR

Rev. Hubert F. Schiffer, S.J., Associate Professor of Economics, College of Business Administration
Loyola University, New Orleans 18, La.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Henry J. Engler, Dean, College of Business Administration
Rev. Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., Chairman, Department of Sociology
Harriette A. Martire, Assoc. Professor, Department of Education
Bernard J. Offerman, President, New Orleans Young Christian Workers
G. Ralph Smith, Assoc. Prof. of Management, Coll. of Bus. Adm.
Rev. Louis J. Twomey, S.J., Director, Institute of Social Order

SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST (published monthly by the Institute of Social Order, Loyola University) is dedicated to the promotion of the private enterprise system, of co-operation and fair dealing between management and labor, of interracial justice and harmony, and, in general, of the Christian reconstruction of our modern socio-economic life. Every issue presents applications of sound principles to the concrete problems of modern life, especially in sociology and economics, by printing condensations of speeches, books and magazine articles by well qualified experts. Thus, **SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST** hopes to stimulate intelligent discussions of vital topics and promote action to strengthen the spirit of personal responsibility.

Subscription: $3.00 — 39 months; $2.00 — 25 months; $1.00 — one year.

A FAIR SHARE FOR EVERY CHILD! (Cont'd from P. 1)

liberties guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The requirements of the national defense, as well as the general welfare of our country, demand that, in educational opportunities, no child be treated as a second-class citizen. Hence it is unthinkable that any American child be denied the federal funds allotted to other children which are necessary for his mental development because his parents choose for him a God-centered education.

A Penalty On Religious Beliefs

To me, it is also unthinkable that Congress would deny a child funds to study mathematics, science and languages simply because his parents supply additional funds for the study of religion. This would be penalizing both the child and his parents because of their religious beliefs.

As an American whose loyalties have been challenged only by Communists, I cannot believe that Congress would accept the proposals of the task force and use economic compulsion to force parents to relinquish their rights to have religion taught to their children.

I cannot believe that Congress would discriminate against Lutheran, Baptist, Catholic or Jewish parents — Americans all — in the allocation of educational funds. I cannot believe that Congress would enact a program of financial assistance to elementary and secondary education unless all children were granted equal educational privileges regardless of the school they attend. This procedure would insure the civil rights of independent school children and of their parents and would then incorporate in the task force program the First Amendment principles of religious and academic freedom in the pursuit of truth.

Our Constitution not only demands that all children be treated alike, regardless of their exercise of religion, in the choice of school, but Congress has established many precedents of this equal treatment. To quote just a few:

Direct Grants To Students

In the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952, Congress provided for direct grants to veterans to enable them to pay tuition in the school of their choice. Many GI's used these funds to pay tuition in the nation's 474 Protestant, 265 Catholic and 5 Jewish institutions of higher learning.

In the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956, Congress provided for direct grants to students whose fathers died as a result of the second World War or the Korean conflict. Many of America's orphan students are using these grants to pay tuition in church-related colleges.

And in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Congress provided for direct grants to graduate fellows, many of whom are pursuing their studies in universities under religious auspices.

A number of States have also adopted the method of direct grants to students in extensive scholarship programs which give the award winners freedom of choice in education.

Separation Of Church And State

It is a matter of record that programs of direct grants to students and children attending church-related schools do not breach the wall of separation of church and state.

Discussing the GI Bill, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School observed that it "does not believe that this assistance to veterans was designed to help, even indirectly, the institution." This means that Congress can subsidize children and students without subsidizing the schools.

If Congress were to comply with the task force proposals as outlined by its committee — and once again I express my faith that Congress would not do so — and compel a child to attend a state school as a condition for sharing in education funds, it would be engaging in thought control, which, as Supreme Court Justice Jackson remarked, "is a copyright of totalitarianism and we have no claim to it."

MORALS and PSYCHOLOGY

By JOHN MARSHALL

Condensed from THE MONTH (41 Farm St., London W. I., England), Dec. 1960, pp. 354 f.

It is just over 30 years since the great moral theologian Vermeersch wrote that "the grave and thorny problem . . . of subjective imputability" is the challenge of our age, and the statement is as true today. It may seem bold for a layman to venture into this field, but the need today is for more secular students of and contributions to this subject. Moreover, a more responsible outlook on the part of the layman is very much in keeping with the modern view of the lay apostolate in the Church. The day when a doctor could say, with an apparently clear conscience, that he was concerned only with the medical aspects of a case, and that morals were a matter for the priest, is happily fast disappearing. Modern ethical problems cannot be adequately met by a system by which the secular aspects of a problem are dealt with by one expert and the sacred by another, the person with the problem being buffeted between the two like a boat adrift on a stormy sea.

It is a fundamental Catholic teaching that man is possessed of free-will. By this we mean that at the

time of a decision a man is able to make, or not to make, that decision. But it is not part of the doctrine of free-will that all the acts of man are subject to his free choice. Man is composed of matter, hence is subject to the laws of physics and chemistry; this matter is integrated into a biological organism, hence he is subject to the laws of biology; this biological organism is extremely developed, hence man behaves in conformity with the laws of that branch of biology we designate as psychology. Nor is non-voluntary activity confined to simple or unusual actions. Slips of the tongue, of which Freud made so much, are an example of a human action which is non-voluntary. The production of evidence that such slips are not of choice, but are manifestations of activity in the unconscious, in no way affects our view of free-will, for it has never been suggested that free-will was concerned. Theologians have distinguished these two types of acts as *actus humanus*, where the action is the result of a deliberate choice of the will, and *actus hominis* where, though a human being is acting, it is not as a result of the exercise of his will.

Having made this distinction between these two kinds of human acts, we must not commit the modern error of the specialists, by thinking that man usually acts with either one or the other type of act. In practice most acts are a compound of both types, the voluntary utilizing the involuntary to attain its end, or the involuntary provoking in its train a voluntary action. Thus the attraction of a man towards a woman may be primarily involuntary, but whether this initial biological reaction produces any results depends upon the intervention of the voluntary. It would be as foolish to suggest that sexual attractions only arises as an act of the will, as it would be to suggest that it is quite outside human control. The two aspects of human actions, the voluntary and the involuntary, are interwoven in this very common human situation.

It is therefore in the realm of the *actus humanus*, or fully human act, that free-will is exercised. But, contrary to what is commonly alleged, the doctrine of free-will does not propose that the will is entirely free from influence, even in those acts of man that are fully human. The will is subjected to many influences including that of non-voluntary acts. There are forces within ourselves, and in our environment, which hamper and oppose the exercise of our will, making choice more difficult. But in the final analysis, in normal people the will is able to accept or reject a course of action. In the words of Pius XII the fact that "energies may exercise pressure on an activity does not necessarily signify that they compel it."

The word freedom is therefore used with two different meanings. In Catholic doctrine freedom of the will does not mean a will that is free from all influence. It does mean that when all influence has been brought to bear, including that of grace, the will is still able to accept or reject a course of action. The ease with which it does this affects the degree of responsibility of the man for his action, hence the amount of praise or blame he will thereby acquire. In much psychological usage, on the other hand, freedom of the will means a will entirely free from influence. Because the will is patiently not free from influence, this usage would deny freedom of the will, but what they deny is not the freedom of the will of Catholic doctrine. Hence confusion in the meaning of words adds to the difficulties of an already difficult subject.

The essential discrepancy between phychoanalytical theory and the doctrine of free-will is that the former asserts that man is so influenced by the forces in his unconscious as to be completely determined in his human acts. His subjective experience of free choice is an illusion, for all the while he is being directed by forces of which he is unaware. It follows from this that though a man's acts may be imputed to him, he is not responsible for them as truly voluntary acts. Punishment and reward, whether bestowed by human agency or divine have therefore no meaning, except in so far as they provide another influence determining the conduct of man.

Theologians have always recognized that ignorance, fear, passion and violence may interfere with the freedom of a human act. Most commonly the examples quoted in theological writings are of simple ignorance that a thing is wrong, as when a person's culture has taught him that a plurality of wives is the normal state; or of sudden and severe accesses of fear or passion, arising in a person whose usual behavior appears to be unimpeded by such forces. Such examples create the impression that interference with the freedom of the will is unusual; the exception rather than the rule.

There is another influence upon current thinking about the problem of responsibility. Man's faculties are often conceived as operating in isolation one from another. Thus the emotions are deemed to have no direct effect upon the will. The traditional view is that the intellect presents information to the will, upon which the latter acts. Emotion may cloud the intellect so that the information presented to the will is not a true representation of reality, but it does not affect the will directly. This insulation of the will endows it with an ethereal quality, as though it were disembodied, and capable of acting o t h e r than through, and in response to, the activity of the body. It takes no account for example of the fact that physical debility may so impoverish the person, that the will becomes incapable of effective action despite a clear vision of what should be done.

Accompanying this habit of isolating the will, there is a further tendency to particulate man's nature into many compartments: will, intellect, memory, understanding, emotions and so on. Some of these compartments are again subdivided, as in the case of the emotions into concupiscible and irascible emotions, and these again are further subdivided into a variety of single emotions, as though they were entities, rather than different manifestations of the one man acting. The impression created by this manner of writing is that man is a compound of many individual forces acting largely independently one of another. Thus the will is conceived as acting serenely in isolation until suddenly it is deviated from its course by an impulse such as anger.

This view of man seems to me to have been an important factor in our present failure to grapple successfully with the problem of the freedom of certain acts, and of man's responsibility for them, hence I would like to spend a little time on it, and especially upon the influence of the intellect upon responsibility. Man is nothing if not a unity, an integrated whole. Even though his soul is a substance in its own right, it is recognized by philosophers as an incomplete substance, for without the body it is incapable of many actions. Thus the moment the soul and body are separated, man can sin no more, nor can

he merit. It is the integration of soul and body, that makes the being, who is capable of truly human acts. The habit of thinking of the body as an unimportant appendage of the soul is bad. The question, "Of which must I take most care, of my body or of my soul?" with its answer, "I must take most care of my soul, etc.," entirely ignores the fact that man will be saved or lost, soul and body for all eternity. Difficult as it is, we must accustom ourselves to think of man, not of his soul or of his body; of man acting, not of his will working in a vacuum.

This integration of man's soul and body in our thinking must extend further to embrace in our conceptual picture all manifestations of man's activities, the will, the intellect, the emotions and so on. We must not think of anger as rendering the will impotent; rather it is the angry man who may be incapable of a free act. We must not consider penance as subduing the body so as to render the will more free; rather it is the mortified man who is least impeded in his human acts. This is not just a semantic device, but it is the expression of a concept which is vital to any real understanding of the difficulties of the individual who needs help with a problem of responsibility.

Viewing the intellect in this light, we see that it does not operate in isolation. The understanding and appraisal of knowledge is always influenced by the emotional state of the individual. The emotional overtones may be intense or slight, but they are always there. Depression or anxiety, even when unrelated to the current task, influence our ability to understand and handle the present problem. We recognize this full well when we declare that sex in its human application cannot be satisfactorily taught in schools as though it were algebra, because intellectual appreciation cannot be divorced from emotional reaction. But we do not recgnize the same interweaving of the intellectual and emotional activity of man, when we consider the responsibility of a man for his acts. "Did you know it was yrong?" is an inadequate question, when put in isolation, to determine moral responsibility. A man may know a thing is wrong in the sense that he has been so informed by an authority, but he may not *feel* that it is wrong, either at the time of acting or even in some cases more continuously. The act is still of course objectively wrong, for the moral law is objective not subjective, but whether the fact is subjectively wrong cannot be decided only by what is in the man's intellect; it must take into account the state of the whole man.

This question of knowing and appreciating the morality of an act is extremely relevant to current situations in which the question of responsibility frequently arises. Cognition or knowing has been divided into two types: conceptual, when a person simply knows or is informed of a matter, and evaluative, when he knows, appreciates, and realizes the full significance of all that is involved in that item of knowledge. A person with conceptual knowledge only, may be incapable of a fully human act with regard to this knowledge, because he lacks that essential element of full awareness of his potential responsibility, which is necessary for a human act.

Diminution of responsibility is often alleged with regard to sexual acts. Usually it is the overwhelming effect of the sexual urge that is advanced as the factor which diminishes responsibility, and indeed this emotional factor may play an important part. But in my experience the factor of conceptual versus evaluative knowledge more often requires to be weighed. This may seem at first sight surprising, for who does not know that the misuse of sex is wrong. But more careful thought reveals that the problem is by no means so simple. The majority of people complete their religious education when they leave school at the age of fifteen years. At that time their instruction in the morality of sexual acts has of necessity been limited by their immaturity. Thereafter they are given no systematic instruction. Such enlightenment as they subsequently receive, because it is given by media such as sermons and pastoral letters, must be couched in the most general terms. Intermingled with this instruction is a vast indoctrination in the opposite sense, accomplished by films, books, magazines, newspapers, radio and television, either directly and overtly, or indirectly and subtly. If we objectively appraise these facts, dwell upon them without prejudice, and remind ourselves constantly that we who are judging have often spent years in deep and detailed study of these matters, in contrast to the haphazard enlightenment of those we judge, can we be surprised that many people lack an evaluative knowledge of, for example, the evil of contraception?

A re-education, a change of outlook is required, this process being the conversion of conceptual to evaluative knowledge, a process involving the adjustment of emotional attitudes as well as an operation of the intellect, so that the knowledge no longer belongs only to the intellect, but to the whole man, influencing his entire being and behavior.

The conversion of conceptual to evaluative knowledge is no longer easily achieved by appeal to authority. When the standard of literacy is low, a declaration from authority is an effective way of providing evaluative knowledge. This is because the illiterate person develops a series of infallible guides such as the priest, the doctor, the school-master and the lawyer, who provide for his information which he is able to accept without question, and integrate into his plan of life as evaluative knowledge. With the increase of literacy, though these guides remain, they no longer have the same prestige and value to the individual. Hence there arise those apparent paradoxes whereby individuals, in apparent good faith, can declare themselves loyal members of the Church, while rejecting one aspect of her moral code.

My view is that the commonest factor influencing responsibility today is not the power of overwhelming emotion, but the lack of evaluative knowledge of the true nature of the evils which afflict our society. The difficulties often stem from a failure to acquire an integrated evaluative knowledge of God's plan for living.

* * *

Don't Just Sit There—ACT!

"No quotation can be found in the Bible in which Our Lord said, 'I was hungry and you organized a discussion group for me'."

—Rev. Andrew M. Greeley

* * *

The man who rolls up his sleeves seldom loses his shirt.

NEIGHBORS AND SOCIAL STATUS

From the report of the Commission on Race and Housing "Where Shall We Live?" University of California Press.

The central problem in practically all aspects of race relations is social status, and housing is no exception. The presence of minority persons in a neighborhood in the capacity of servants, caretakers, janitors, or the like rarely, if ever, attracts unfavorable notice from the whites. The latter become disturbed only when minorities come in under circumstances which imply equality of status.

Two considerations are basic: first, non-white color and certain ethnic origins are identified with low status in American society; second, a family shares to a large extent the status of its neighbors, and the neighborhood one lives in is a measure of his social position.

Therefore, when minority people move into a neighborhood, the resident whites may feel that their own status becomes equated with that of a low-ranking group. Whites, who may themselves be relatively unprejudiced, may be sensitive of the opinion of others—their friends, or even strangers.

For instance, a white woman, commenting on a negro family's purchase of a house a few doors away, observed that it was "a fine family," the huband was a surgeon, and she had no personal objection to them whatsoever. But, she added, people driving by see the little boy playing on the sidewalk.

"How are they to know that he is a doctor's son?"

A CATHOLIC NEGRO GIRL AT GEORGIA UNIVERSITY

ATLANTA, Ga., Jan.16—"I want to go back . . . whatever it entails."

The speaker was Charlayne Hunter, 18, the negro girl whose fight to end racial segregation at the University of Georgia has won nationwide praise.

A convert to Catholicism and a parishioner at St. Paul of the Cross church here, Miss Hunter stressed in an interview that the "main purpose for attending Georgia was to obtain an education with a sound basis."

Miss Hunter and another negro student, Hamilton Holmes, 19, were admitted to the state university early in January at the order of Federal Judge W. A. Bottle. They were the first negroes ever to enroll in the previously all-white school, oldest chartered state university in the nation.

Officials of the university in Athens, Ga., suspended Miss Hunter and Mr. Holmes "in the interest of their safety" after rioting by students and other persons (Jan. 11) against their presence on the campus. But later (Jan. 16) they returned under Federal court orders.

The suspension of the two students was sparked by a crowd estimated at 2,000 which demonstrated outside the dormitory where Miss Hunter was staying. Rioters smashed windows in the dormitory, exploded firecrackers and shouted: "Go home, nigger." Police arrested 12 students and 9 other persons, 8 of whom were indentified as members of the Ku Klux Klan.

As Miss Hunter was sped away from the campus she clutched a small statue of the Blessed Virgin. "The Madonna is a permanent fixture of my room," she commented later. She said the statue was a gift from the nuns stationed at St. Paul of the Cross church and has always meant much to her.

"I took it with me when I went to Wayne University in Detroit," she said. "When I enrolled at Georgia, the Madonna naturally went with me." She said her Rosary was always with her during her first trying days at the university. "It was a great consolation," she declared, "especially Wednesday evening" — at the time of the rioting.

Miss Hunter also praised the university's Newman Club. She said girls from the group sought her out and were a "bright spot for me." Father Cronan Kelly, club director, visited her and told her that Mass had been offered for her at the club on her first day at the university.

Later, as Miss Hunter and Mr. Holmes prepared to return to the university, Father Kelly stressed in a person (Jan. 15) that "The Catholic Church is color blind." He said that relatively few students had taken part in the demonstrations, but added: "Because we are part of the institution, we must share the guilt." He urged students not to give encouragement to violence even by joining crowds of curiosity seekers thronging the two negroes. "Don't go to watch," he said. "Many at the Crucifixion went just to watch."

Since her conversion in December 1958, Miss Hunter has been active in church affairs, especially in the Catholic Youth Organization. Her father is a Methodist minister and military chaplain, Chaplain (Maj.) Charles Hunter. He lives in San Antonio, Texas, where he is stationed at Brooke General Hospital at Fort Sam Houston. (NCWC News Service)

Lift Up Your Eyes and See!

Turn World Problems Into Opportunities

Condensed from **CHRISTOPHER NOTES** (18 E. 48th St., New York 17, N. Y.), Feb. 1961

The problems that push and shove us as we move towards the 21st century are enough to spin our heads. But the 40 eventful years leading up to the year 2000 are filled with great hope as well as serious dangers.

Lift up your eyes and see how you can help to bring the peace of Christ to the jet-propelled decades ahead. These considerations may hely you:

Those endowed with Christian optimism, and sparked by a dynamic faith, hope and charity, will see in the future a breathtaking opportunity for peace instead of disaster.

A few living and actiing boldly for peace may save millions dying for it.

You can be a collaborator with God in bringing to others a foretaste of the peace and justice they are destined to enjoy for all eternity. "Not that we are sufficient to think anything of oursalves, as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God." (2 Corinthians 3:5)

The forces of evil are playing for big stakes—and for keeps. They believe they can gain the whole world, and are moving swiftly to infiltrate every field of influence with men and women committed to their cause.

Solutions to our modern problems do no come in cellophane wrappers or in cookie-tin patterns. But at least some answer can be found if you and millions like you, with God's grace, roll up your sleeves and tackle them.

Harvest of Shame

Social Actionist Urges U. S. Agrarian Reforms

A Report on a Lecture by Rt. Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins, Director of the Social Action Department, N. C. W. C., before the Catholic Economic Association's annual meeting at St. Louis, Missouri, December 28, 1960. (NC)

The U.S. farm labor system is "based on poverty and destitution" and must be reformed, Msgr. George G. Higgins has declared.

"American farm workers — especially migratory workers — are among the least privileged of any major occupational group in the nation," said Msgr. Higgins.

"Anyone who has seen the condition under which most of these workers live knows that it is not necessary to go abroad to observe human beings living in abject poverty."

Msgr. Higgins called for enactment by Congress of legislation guaranteeing a minimum wage to farm workers, ending child labor on farms and providing for registration of leaders of migrant worker crews.

Public Law 78

He also strongly attacks Public Law 78, under which Mexican nationals (braceros) are imported into this country to work on farms. He said the bracero program has cut down the work available to domestic laborers and has helped keep their wages low.

"The question that must be decided on all levels of government, but especially on the Federal level, is: 'Shall we make it a matter of public policy to perpetuate these conditions, or shall we attempt now to eliminate this social blight from the American scene?' " he said.

Urging a minimum wage for farm workers, Msgr. Higgins charged that many employers of such workers look upon them as "a commodity to be bought at the lowest possible price."

He cited a recently published Labor Department study which showed that in May, 1959, nine percent of the workers employed in the north central states received less than 30 cents per hour; 27 percent less than 50 cents; and 50 percent less than 70 cents. In the southern states, the figures were seven percent less than 30 cents per hour; 48 percent less than 50 cents; and 80 percent less than 70 cents.

The average annual earnings from all sources for farm worers are less than $1,000, he stated.

Msgr. Higgins declared that the question whether a rise in farm wages might mean a rise in food prices for consumers "has no bearing whatsoever" on the issue. He quoted Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell as saying:

"In this country we do not choose to keep down our bills, including our food bills, at the cost of overworking and underpaying human beings. We choose to pay the price necessary to support an adequate wage."

Child Labor

On the child labor question, he cited a Census Bureau estimate that 457,000 children worked for pay on farms in 1957.

Referring to this as "one of the most ugly facets of the farm labor situation," he added: "The exploitation of children by agriculture is harmful not only to the children who are employed on American farms, but to adult workers as well."

"The presence of thousands of child workers in our fields exerts a downward pressure on the already rock-bottom wages earned by adult workers," he pointed out.

Registration of migrant labor crew leaders is necessary to protect the workers from irresponsible or dishonest leaders who attempt to exploit and cheat them, he said.

"Reports of abuses by unscrupulous crew leaders are too numerous to ignore," he stated.

Msgr. Higgins recalled that between March and October, 1959, he served on a Labor Department committee to study the working of Public Law 78 — the bracero law.

He said his observation led him to believe that the availability of a pool of low-priced foreign labor cuts down on the number of work days available to domestic workers and tends to keep wages low.

He said Congress "could legislate on this problem from now until doomsday and accomplish very little unless and until it either repeals or radically amends Public Law 78."

He endorsed, with one exception, the aims of a bill introduced in the House of Representatives last March by Rep. George S. McGovern of South Dakota. The bill calls for changes in the law and for the extension of the bracero program to June 30, 1966.

Msgr. Higgins recommended instead that the program be terminated in "1963 or 1964 at the very latest." He said this would give farm employers adequate time to adjust to the new conditions.

Safe Driving Is A Moral Duty

By RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING

Condensed from **THE PILOT** (49 Franklin St., Boston 10, Mass.) Dec. 31, 1960, p. 3.

We have all been shocked by the increasing number of fatal accidents on the highways. Almost 40,000 persons lost their lives in motor vehicle accidents during the past year. The plain fact is thus forced upon our attention that each day of the year in the United States 100 persons are killed who would remain alive if they had not become involved in auto accidents.

It is impossible to escape the conclusion that this appalling sacrifice of human life represents a serious moral problem. I feel bound in conscience, therefore, my dearly beloved brethren, to demand that you place this problem high on the list of the problems which concern your state of soul before God. For this is no mere matter of civic pride or community cooperation. This is something which reaches deeply into every man's personal relations with his Creator. It was God Himself Who issued the solemn commandment: "Thou shalt not kill." And it is God, Himself, Who gives to each of us the bodily life which we risk when we disobey the elementary rules of caution imposed upon us by officials who have jurisdiction over the highways.

There can be no doubt about our moral responsibility to observe these rules. We are guilty of the sin of murder not only by shooting to kill, or by deliberately and maliciously shedding human blood. We are guilty of the sin of murder whenever we knowingly and without justification engage in any form of activity from which death can follow. The law of God in this matter cuts through all legal differentiations of degree in murder. The law of God is concerned primarily with our moral obligation to safeguard the bodily life over which He alone has full right of ownership. We are bound by God's law never to take unnecessary risks with our own lives or with those of our fellow human beings. When we do so, we are violating the Fifth Commandment, even though we may be fortunate enough to avoid the hideous reality of murder itself.

Putting all this into the concrete setting in which motor vehicle accidents occur, we are forced to the conclusion that the seriously enacted provisions of law for the safety of the highways are binding under pain of sin. Reckless speeding, drunken driving, contemptuous violation of traffic signals, weaving in and out of line without regard for plainly indicated road markings — these are sins before God no less than offenses punishable by State law. When we kneel in the tribunal of Penance to confess our sins, we must be no less concerned about our failure to drive safely than we are about other matters which come more quickly to mind as we examine our consciences. The time has come when this question must be put to himself by every auto driver whenever he is preparing to go to confession: "have I wilfully and carelessly driven in such a way as to endanger human life?"

This is plain and simple language that every one can understand. I feel certain, my dearly beloved brethren, that a large percentage of highway fatalities could be avoided if every auto driver were to remind himself of his responsibility before God to drive safely. Let us then cooperate with the earnest and unrelenting efforts which responsible officials throughout the nation are making to reduce the hazards of driving. If we refuse to do so, we shall have to answer to God Himself. Let us all promise, then, to drive safely, and let us regard the keeping of this promise as pertaining to the firm purpose of amending our lives which is essential for the forgiveness of our sins.

Write for a *complete* set (January - December)

SOCIAL ACTION DIGEST 1960

Price: $1.00 incl. postage. Please enclose payment with order.

Address: Rev. Hubert F. Schiffer, S.J.
Loyola University, New Orleans 18, La.